

[20th April 1959]

[Mr. Speaker]

VI.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE MADRAS CONTINGENCY FUND (AMENDMENT) BILL, ^a 1959.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg leave to introduce the Madras Contingency Fund (Amendment) Bill 1959.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

‘ That leave be granted for the introduction of the Madras Contingency Fund (Amendment) Bill, 1959.’

The motion was put and carried and leave was granted.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I introduce the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER : The Bill is introduced.

VII.—REPORT^b OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE MADRAS
ASSEMBLY RULES.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

‘ That the amendments as approved by the Select Committee on the Madras Assembly Rules be taken into consideration ’.

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved—

‘ That the amendments as approved by the Select Committee on the Madras Assembly Rules be taken into consideration ’.

I have received notice of amendments to the Report of the Select Committee, from the hon. Members Sri T. S. Ramaswami Pillai and Sri S. Lazar. I have already given a ruling on a previous occasion that when a matter has gone through a Select Committee and changes have been adopted, only amendments to those changes will be permitted in the House. It is not open to Members to give notice of amendments to clauses which were not considered by the Select Committee. The Rules Committee is in fact a Select Committee. Therefore I am not quite sure whether I would allow the hon. Members Sri Lazar and Sri Ramaswami Pillai to move their amendments. Though I may be anticipating what the Assembly is going to approve, I may inform hon. Members that there is going to be a permanent Rules Committee which will from time to time consider resolutions and amendments that may be given notice of by the hon. Members. In view of this I hope the hon. Members Sri Lazar and Sri Ramaswami Pillai will not press their amendments.

If the hon. Members want to speak on the Report of the Rules Committee, they may speak. (After a pause) If no hon. Member is speaking, I will put the motion to the vote of the House.

^a Published in the Fort St. George Gazette Extraordinary, dated 20th April 1959.

^b Printed as Appendix X on pages 53-70 infra.

20th April 1959]

[Mr. Speaker]

The question is—

‘ That the amendments as approved by the Select Committee on the Madras Assembly Rules be taken into consideration ’.

The motion was put and carried and the amendments were taken into consideration.

Rules 2, 5, 9 and 14, as amended, were put and carried.

Rule 20.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

‘ That Rule 20 as amended be passed.’

SRI N. K. PALANISAMI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move the following amendment, namely:—

For the figure and letters ‘ 8-30 a.m.’, substitute the figure and letters ‘ 9 a.m.’.

The amendment was duly seconded.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion as well as the amendment are before the House for discussion.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMI: I feel, 8-30 a.m. will be too early.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: The rule says: ‘ The sittings of the Assembly shall, unless the Speaker otherwise directs, ordinarily commence at 8-30 a.m.’ The Speaker may fix it even at 9 a.m. It is for the Business Advisory Committee to decide. The rule only indicates that the sitting will be in the forenoon. We have to indicate a time, that is all and we have done it. The hon. Member need not be under the impression that the House will always commence its sittings at 8-30 a.m. only.

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

‘ That rule 20 as amended be passed.’

The motion was put and carried.

Rules 23 and 31 as amended and New Rule 31-A were put and carried.

Rule 33.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

‘ That Rule 33 as amended be passed’.

[20th April 1959]

SRI N. K. PALANISAMI : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move the following amendment, namely :

In proviso 1, for the words ' with the consent of the Minister concerned ' substitute the word ' may '.

The amendment was duly seconded.

MR. SPEAKER : The motion and the amendment are before the House for discussion.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMI : கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இப்பொழுது கீள்வதான வந்த ஏழு திணைக்களுக்குள் டிபார்ட்மெண்ட்குப் பொகவேண்டும் என்றும், அதன் பிறகு பதநான்கு திணைக்களுக்குள் அந்தக் கேள்விக்கு டிபார்ட்மெண்டிலிருந்து பதில் கரியூதரிசிக் கு வரவேண்டும் என்றும் இருக்கிறது. இது வரவேற்கத்தக்க அம்சமாக இருக்கிறது. இருந்தாலும் அந்தக் கேள்வி சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மத்திய ஆவர்களும் கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களும் கலந்து கொண்டு சீக்கிரத்திலேயே அனுமதிக்கலாம் என்றும் இருக்கிறது. குறைவான நாட்களுக்குள் கூட அனுமதிக்கலாம் என்றும் இருக்கிறது. கனம் சபாநாயகருக்கு அனுமதிப்பதற்கு தனிப்பட்ட அதிகாரம் இருக்க வேண்டும். சில சமயங்களில் பதில்கள் சீக்கிரத்திலேயே கிடைத்து விடுகின்றன; சில சமயங்களில் எவ்வளவு சீக்கிரத்தில்தான் சொல்லக்கூடியதாக இருந்தாலும் பதில்கள் கிடைப்பதில்லை. சில சமயங்களில் அவசியமான கேள்விகளுக்கும் பதில்கள் வருவது இல்லை. அப்படி இருக்கக்கூடாது என்பதற்காகத்தான் திருத்தம் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. கனம் சபாநாயகர் அனுமதித்தால் அது 14 நாட்களுக்குள் வரவேண்டும் என்பதற்காக "மே" என்பதற்குப் பதலாக "ஷல்" என்று இருக்க வேண்டும் என்று திருத்தம் கொடுத்திருக்கிறேன். அதை ஏற்றுக் கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்றும் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

MR. SPEAKER : The Department must be ready and the Minister also must be ready with the answer.

SRI R. SRINIVASA IYER : The Hon. Speaker must have discretion in the matter.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member does not want that.

SRI R. SRINIVASA IYER : Discretion must be there. Then there is the other amendment.

MR. SPEAKER : It relates to Rule 39.

Is the hon. Member pressing his amendment?

SRI N. K. PALANISAMI : No, Sir.

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

' That Rule 33 as amended be passed. '

The motion was put and carried.

20th April 1959]

Rule 39.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I move—

‘That rule 39 as amended be passed.’

SRI N. K. PALANISAMI : Sir, I move the following amendment :—

‘In the proviso to Rule 39, for the words and punctuation “may, in his discretion”, substitute the word “shall” and after the words “the day or” insert the word “on”.’

The amendment was duly seconded.

MR. SPEAKER : Now the motion and the amendment are before the House for discussion.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMI : கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, சாதாரணமாக அரை மணி நேரம் விவாதிக்கலாம் என்று ரூலில் இருந்தாலும் கூட வேகு குறைவான சமயங்களில் தான் அப்படிப்பட்ட விவாதம் அனுமதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இப்பொழுதுள்ளபடி அந்த நாளிலேயா அல்லது வேறு எந்த நாளிலாவது சபாநாயகர் அனுமதித்தபடி அரை மணி நேரம் விவாதிக்க அனுமதிக்கப்படும் என்று இருக்கிறது. அப்படி இல்லாமல் கட்டாயமாக ஒரு நாளாவது அனுமதிக்கப்பட வேண்டும் என்று திருத்தம் செய்யவேண்டும் என்று திருத்தம் கொடுத்திருக்கிறேன். அதை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்றும் கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன்.

MR. SPEAKER : The amendment compels the Speaker.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : It should be in the discretion of the Hon. Speaker to allow a half-hour debate or not. Therefore, I do not think that by a rule we should say that the Hon. Speaker ‘shall’ allow it. This matter should be left to the Hon. Speaker.

The amendment of Sri N. K. Palanisami was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘That Rule 39 as amended be passed.’

The motion was put and carried.

Rule 42.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I move—

‘That rule 42 as amended be passed.’

SRI N. K. PALANISAMI : Sir, I move the following amendment :—

In Rule 42, delete the words “and obtain the Speaker’s consent to his asking for leave to make the motion”.

[20th April 1959]

The amendment was duly seconded.

MR. SPEAKER : Now the motion and the amendment are before the House for discussion.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMI : ஒரு ஒத்தி வைப்புப் பிரேரணை கொண்டுமே வேண்டுமென்றால் அந்த ஒத்தி வைப்புப் பிரேரணைப்பளிக்கும்பாட்டின் உடையதாக இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று இருக்கிறது. ஏற்கெனவே எந்த ஒத்திவைப்பு தீர்மானத்தைக்கொண்டு வந்தாலும் சட்ட பையில் மறுக்கலா? அனுமதிக்கவோ வழி இக்கிறதா? நினைக்கிறேன். மேலும் எப்போது கன்வென்ஷன் கூட ஒரு மெம்பர் ஒரு பிரேரணையைக் கொண்டு வந்தாலும் அதை சபையில் படித்து அனுமதிக்கலாம், அல்லது நிராகரிக்கலாம். ஆகவே ஒரு மெம்பர் ஒரு ஒத்தி வைப்புப் பிரேரணையைக் கொண்டு வந்தால் தகுந்த முறையில் இருநால் அதை அனுமதிக்கவேண்டும். இல்லாவிட்டால் அனுமதிக்கவில்லை என்று சொல்வதுடன், சபையில் அதைத் தெரிவிக்கவேண்டும். அதற்காக இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, this rule relates to an adjournment motion. An adjournment motion has to satisfy certain criteria for the purpose of being admitted as an adjournment motion and the Hon. Speaker in the final authority in this matter. Whatever might be the procedure, it is for the Hon. Speaker to decide whether it comes under an adjournment motion or not. If he decides that it does not come under an adjournment motion, he straightaway rejects it. No doubt, he may send for the hon. Member who has given notice of it and explains it. It is only when there is a doubt whether a particular matter comes under an adjournment motion, it is brought to the notice of the House and an opportunity is given to the concerned hon. Member and the Minister to explain their viewpoints and then the Hon. Speaker makes up his mind whether to allow the adjournment motion or reject it, and not in every case. Therefore, the amendment is clearly out of order and I do not think we should accept it.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘In Rule 42, delete the words “and obtain the Speaker’s consent to his asking for leave to make the motion”.’

The amendment was put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘That Rule 42 as amended be passed.’

The motion was put and carried.

Rules 46, 47 and 54 as amended were put and carried.

20th April 1959]

Rule 64.

MR. SPEAKER : The motion is—

‘ That Rule 64 as amended be passed.’

The hon. Member, Sri T. S. Ramaswami Pillai, who has given notice of an amendment to this rule is not in his seat. (The hon. Member Sri S. Lazar rose). Hon. Members can however speak on the rule.

SRI S. LAZAR : இந்த 64-வது ரூலில் கொடுத்திருக்கக் கூடிய தீர்மானத்தைப் பற்றி ஒரு சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். சாதாரணமாக ஒரு பார்லிமென்ட் ரிடிபேட்டில் ஒருவர் பேசுகின்றபோது அதில் எழக்கூடிய பிரச்சனைகளை அப்போதைக்கப்போதே ஆங்காங்கு குறுக்கிடக் கேட்பது நல்ல முறையில் விவாதத்தினை சாதாரண உயர்த்தக் கூடியதாகக் கூட இருக்கும் என்று நாம் அறிந்திருக்கிறோம். நம் சபையில் கூட இதுபோன்ற சம்மர்கள் நடந்திருக்கிறது. அதேபோல் கேட்பதற்கு ஒவ்வொரு அங்கத்தினருக்கும் உரிமை இருக்க வேண்டும் என்பது என்ன தர்மமான கருத்து. (He shall ask the question through the Speaker) அந்த உரிமையை கேள்வி கேட்பதற்கு சபாநாயகர் மூலமாக கேட்க வேண்டுமென்று இருப்பது சிறந்தது என்பது என்ன தர்மமான கருத்து. அந்த ரகப் பதிலாக அனுபதி முன்பாசவே பெறவேண்டுமென்று சொன்னால் அதற்கு அவசியம் இல்லை என்று நான் கருதுகிறேன். அதைப் பின்போது கேட்பதற்கு ஒரு தடை, அதனால் உடனுக்குடன் பிரச்சனை எழுப்ப முடியாத தடை எல்லாம் உண்டாகும். பிரிட்டிஷ் பார்லிமென்ட் பிரொவீசனர்ப் புரட்டிப் பர்த்தால் கூட சாதாரணமாக ஒரு அமைச்சர் கேட்கப்போது இடையிடையே மறுத்துக் கேட்கப்படுவதையும் காணலாம். நம் சபையில் அடிக்கடி அந்தமாதிரியான சம்பவம் நடைபெறுகிறது. இந்த ஒரு வாய்ப்பினால் விவாதமும் உயர்ந்த தரமாகிறது. ஏதாவது குறைகள் சொன்னால் அமைச்சர்களால் அதை உடனுக்குடன் மறுத்துச் சொல்லவும் வழி ஏற்படுகிறது. அதேபோல் மற்ற அங்கத்தினர்களுக்கும் அந்த வாய்ப்பு இருக்கவேண்டும். ஆகவே இது அவசியம் என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்கிறேன்.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Sir, I rise to strongly support what the hon. Member, Sri Lazar has explained now. It is an admitted principle in Parliamentary Practice that interruptions are to be allowed. (Interruption from the Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman.) Sir, it is the privilege of hon. Members of this House to know some details and information whenever they are at a loss to follow the speech of the Hon. Minister or whenever they want to explain their views. This principle has been followed in other Parliaments also. At every stage, it is not possible for hon. Members to get the permission of the Chair to intervene and they must be allowed to rise up now and then whenever it is pertinent to interrupt and get elucidation on a particular point.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, the speech of the hon. Member, Sri Lazar and the support of the hon. Member, Sri Vinayakam, arose out of a misunderstanding of the wording of the rule. As a matter of fact, what Mr. Vinayakam has stated in his

[Sri C. Subramaniam] 20th April 1959

2-30
p.m.

speech, is not covered by this rule. As pointed out by the Minister for Industries, Sri Venkataraman, intervention or interpellation ordinarily takes place in a debate to a certain extent. Whether such interruptions may spoil the speech is quite a different matter and the Hon. Speaker will take care of that, not to allow too many interruptions and unnecessary interruptions. Here, for putting a specific question for the purpose of getting elucidation, the provision is made. Till now the rule as it stood was: "It should be put through the Speaker". After all it is not necessary for the Member to state the question and again for the Speaker to put it. Therefore, it is enough if the Member gets the permission of the Speaker. Again permission means, allowing the question itself is permission.

Therefore, in accordance with the practice prevailing here, we have amended the rule. That is all. Therefore, the present practice of interrupting or interjecting is not to be denied. But for the purpose of putting a question for the purpose of getting elucidation, it should be on a specific point and it should be in the form of a question so that it can be put to the speaking Member to answer it. I do not think there is any point made out either by the hon. Member Sri Lazar or the supporting Member Sri Vinayakam.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

"That Rule 64 as amended be passed".

The motion was put and carried.

Rule 92 as amended was put and carried.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS RE (cont.)

(6) MEETING OF THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to make an announcement. I am glad the Hon. Finance Minister brought it to my notice. I have called for a meeting of the Business Advisory Committee at 4 o'clock. But it is likely that the House may finish its business before that. Therefore, the Business Advisory Committee will meet at 4 o'clock or after the business of the House is over.

VII.—REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE MADRAS

ASSEMBLY RULES—(cont.)

Rules 154 and 158 as amended were put and carried.

Rule 163.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is—

"That Rule 163 as amended be passed".

20th April 1959]

SRI R. SRINIVASA IYER : Sir, with reference to Rule 163, I want to say one thing. Of course, I have not given notice of an amendment. In the proviso, it is said that "such number of persons from the Legislative Council . . . may be associated with the Committee." I think the wording may be properly done. 'Persons' does not read well.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : It should be done by a Resolution of the Assembly. Of course, I agree that 'persons' could be changed, though 'persons from the Legislative Council' may mean only 'members of the Council'. Sir, I move—

"In the proviso to Rule 163 (1) as amended for the words 'persons from', substitute the words 'Members of'."

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member Sri N. K. Palanisami has got an amendment in his name. He can move it now.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMI : Sir, I move the following amendment :—

"Delete the proviso to Rule 163 (1)."

The amendment was duly seconded.

MR. SPEAKER : Now the motion and the amendments are before the House for discussion.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMI : இம்மாதிரியான வழக்கம் பார்லிமென்டில் இருக்கிறதா என்று தெரியவில்லை.....

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : இருக்கிறது.

MR. SPEAKER : கனம் வெங்கடராமன் பார்லிமென்டில் இருந்தார். அவரைக் கேளுங்கள்.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMI : நான் இதை வற்புறுத்தவில்லை. ஆனால் பல விஷயத்தைப் பற்றி அவர்கள் பரிசீலனை செய்ய அதிகாரம் இல்லாதபோது கமிட்டி பரிசீலனை பண்ணக்கூடிய விஷயமாக அது எப்படி இருக்கலாம் என்று புரியாததால் கேட்கிறேன். அதைக் கொஞ்சம் விளக்குமபடி கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

*THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : May I just explain? The provision is that the reports of the Accountant-General and the Auditor-General shall be placed before both Houses of the Legislature. Therefore, the Council is also seized of the reports. That is why in Parliament, after a careful debate, it was decided that the Members of the Council of State can also be Members of the Public Accounts Committee.

The amendment of Sri N. K. Palanisami was by leave withdrawn.

[20th April 1959]

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

“ In the proviso to Rule 163 (1) as amended for the words ‘ persons from ’ *substitute* the words ‘ Members of ’.”

The amendment was put and carried.

The amended rule, as further amended, was put and carried.

Rule 171.

MR. SPEAKER : The motion is—

‘ That Rule 171 as amended be passed.’

SRI R. SRINIVASA IYER : Here also, an amendment similar to the one made to Rule 163 is necessary.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I move—

“ In the proviso to Rule 171 (2) as amended *for* the words ‘ persons from ’, *substitute* the words ‘ Members of ’.”

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

“ In the proviso to Rule 171 (2) as amended for the words ‘ persons from ’, *substitute* the words ‘ Members of ’.”

The amendment was put and carried.

The amended rule, as further amended, was put and carried.

Rule 195 as amended was put and carried.

Rule 196.

MR. SPEAKER : The motion is—

‘ That Rule 196, as amended, be passed.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I move—

“ That in the proviso to Rule 196 (1) as amended *for* the words ‘ persons from ’ *substitute* the words ‘ Members of ’.”

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

“ That in the proviso to Rule 196 (1) as amended for the words ‘ persons from ’, *substitute* the words ‘ Members of ’.”

The amendment was put and carried.

The amended rule, as further amended, was put and carried.

Rule 202 as amended was put and carried.

Rule 203.

MR. SPEAKER : The motion is—

‘ That Rule 203 as amended be passed.’

20th April 1959]

SRI R. SRINIVASA IYER : Sir, the wording in rule 203 is not properly done. The provision in the old rule, namely, 'within one month of the commencement of a session of the House' has been removed. But it is said, 'after promulgation of such regulation, rule, sub-rule, by-law, etc., or within such earlier or later period, etc.' It is not quite clear what the words 'earlier or later period' refer to. Previously, in the old rule, because there was the stipulation about one month of the commencement of a session, this expression, earlier or later period, had a proper meaning. But in the new rule, that has been removed, but by oversight, I think, this has been retained. That does not read well.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Let us try to understand it. The original rule says, 'if the committee is of opinion that any order should be annulled wholly or in part or should be amended in any respect, it shall report that opinion and the grounds thereof to the House.' Up to that, there is no difficulty. Then it continues and says, 'within one month of the commencement of the session of the House after the promulgation of such order etc.' Now, this portion has been removed in the amended rule. Therefore, I think the latter portion also should be properly amended, for, 'earlier or later' refers to the month.

Therefore it is not necessary. I agree. In the original rule, we have said, 'within one month'. One month of what? Of the commencement of the session of the House, after the promulgation of the order. Therefore, this 'after the promulgation of such regulation, rule', etc., refers to the commencement of a session of the House. But now 'the commencement of a session of the House' has been removed. Therefore, 'after the promulgation of such regulation, rule', etc., has no meaning at all. The portion, 'it shall report that opinion and the grounds thereof to the House' is all right. If we are not fixing any time limit, it need not necessarily be within one month. We are not fixing a time limit. Therefore, those lines should go.

MR. SPEAKER : What about the proposed sub-rule (2)?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sub-rule (2) is all right and it may remain as it is. Sir, I move—

In the proposed rule 203, sub-rule (1), delete all the words commencing from 'after the promulgation' to 'specified case'.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

In the proposed rule 203, sub-rule (1), delete all the words commencing from 'after the promulgation' to 'specified case'.

The amendment was put and carried.

The amended rule, as further amended, was put and carried.

[20th April 1959]

Rule 207.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I move that Rule 207, as amended, be passed.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘ That Rule 207 as amended be passed.’

The motion was put and carried.

Rule 217.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I move that Rule 217, as amended be passed.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘ That Rule 217 as amended be passed.’

The motion was put and carried.

Rule 218.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I move that Rule 218, as amended be passed.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘ That Rule 218 as amended be passed.’

The motion was put and carried.

Rules 221 to 225.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I move that Rules 221 to 225, as amended be passed.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘ That Rules 221 to 225 as amended be passed.’

The motion was put and carried.

New Rule 232-A.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I move that new Rule 232-A be passed.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘ That New Rule 232-A be passed.’

The motion was put and carried.

Rule 1.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I move that Rule 1, as amended be passed.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘ That Rule 1 as amended be passed.’

The motion was put and carried.

Long Title.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I move that the Long Title, as amended be passed.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘ That the Long Title as amended be passed.’

The motion was put and carried.

20th April 1959]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I move—

That the amended rules, as further amended in certain cases, be passed.

The motion was put and carried.

IV.—ANNOUNCEMENT—*cont.*

(7) SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER : It was originally decided that we should meet here everyday between 1 and 5 p.m. Hon. Members have now expressed a desire that this timing should be changed. The Business Advisory Committee is going to meet now. I shall then communicate its decision to hon. Members.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : To-morrow we will meet at 1 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER : To-morrow we meet at 1 o'clock. I will then announce to hon. Members the decision of the Business Advisory Committee.

I now adjourn the House till 1 o'clock to-morrow.

The House then adjourned.

VIII—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE

A. Statutory Rules and Orders.

1. Amendment to the Madras Village Panchayats Rules, 1950, extending the term of office of the members of the Ambalamudram Panchayat, Tirunelveli district, under section 10 (1) of the Madras Village Panchayats Act, 1950 issued in G.O. No. 480, Local Administration, dated 7th March 1959. [Laid on the table of the House under section 113 (4) of the Madras Village Panchayats Act, 1950 (Madras Act X of 1950).]

2. Regulation under Article 320 (3) of the Constitution of India, issued in G.O. Ms. No. 829, Public (Services-A), dated the 13th March 1959, in regard to Madras State Transport Department Operation Subordinate Service. [Laid on the table of the House under Article 320 (5) of the Constitution of India.]

3. Amendment to the Hotel Special Liquor Licence Rules, 1954, issued in G.O. Ms. No. 516, Home, dated 23rd February 1959. [Laid on the table of the House under section 54 (3) of the Madras Prohibition Act, 1937 (Madras Act X of 1937).]

4. Notification issued under section 1 (4) of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, issued with G.O. Ms. No. 546, Revenue, dated 21st February 1959 in regard to Kathalankottai village, Sivaganqa, as under tenure estate. [Laid on the table of the House under section 67 (4) of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Madras Act XXVI of 1948).]